APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,326	08/04/2003	Shu Lei	5306P107	6782

8791	7590	06/05/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER
CHOW, CHIH CHING

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _16 March 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-7,9-15,17-25,27 and 28_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-7,9-15,17-25,27 and 28_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _04 December 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to amendment dated March 16, 2006.

2.   Per Applicants' request, claims 1, 11, and 19 have been amended, claims 8, 16, and 26 have been canceled.

3.   Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, and 27-28 remain pending.

Response to Amendment

4.   Applicants' amendment for Claims 1, 11, and 19 have been fully considered respectfully by the examiner but they are <u>not</u> persuasive.

5.   The Examiner is maintaining the 35 USC § 103 Rejections. For the Applicants' convenience they are listed as following, with the amendments requested by the Applicants.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, and 27-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by Applicant's amendments to the claims.

7.   The examiner has reviewed the updated amendments, and noted that new matter has been introduced into the disclosure, therefore a different citation has to be introduced. See <u>35 USC § 103 rejections</u> (claims include the amendments) herein below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   Claims 1-7, 9, 11-15, 17, 19-25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,754,885 by Steven Dardinski (hereinafter

"Dardinski"), in view of applicant's admission of prior art (hereinafter "current

applicant").

CLAIM	Dardinski / Current Applicant
1. A method comprising: (a) receiving a configuration for a user interface of an application; (b) determining a set of <u>configuration</u> parameters corresponding to the configuration; and (c) dynamically generating user interface display code at run time <u>for a user, the user interface display code</u> based upon the set of configuration parameters <u>and the user's role within an organization</u>.	In Dardinski, column 15, lines 54-56, under 1.1.3, "The Parameter Definition Editor is an interface which allows **Parameter Definitions to be created** for a Parameterized Object." – here the 'parameterized object' can be the user interface display code for an user interface of an application, the **parameters are used to configure** the user interface, e.g. the position, size, and other attributes. For item (c), See Dardinski's column 35, lines 40-45, "An Implementation-standard Appearance Definition object may be overridden by a **User-Defined Appearance** Definition object at **runtime** to produce **customized displays and printouts** to satisfy **unique customer documentation requirements**" – *dynamically display customer required information. Dardinski also teaches the parameterized objects include user interface display code.* – See Dardinski's column 98, lines 48-53, "2.4.3.12 PLB Block. Referring to FIG. 98 this class contains standard Block methods and **manages the parameters** associated with PLB Blocks. **Source code, interpretive code, and operator display code** for the ladder are generated by the PLB Ladder editor and stored as **Block parameters.**" And lines 60-67, "2.4.3.13 Temporary Source Code This is **a parameter** which **stores the logic source code** of the

associated Ladder while it is **being edited
and before it is successfully compiled.** The
PLB Ladder Editor **presents the contents
of this parameter for editing** (*display
code based upon configuration parameters*)
until it is successfully compiled, at which
time the contents are copied into the Last
Compiled Source Code parameter and
deleted from this parameter." For the user's
view within the organization feature see the
current application paragraph [0003],
"There has been a **tremendous increase in
the number and type of applications
(user-oriented specific-function** software)
provided via internet-related networks"
Since there are tremendous number and
type of 'user-oriented specific function
software" already exist, the user's view
within the organization is not novel. Also
in Dardinski's column 34, lines 23-34, "
Objects of the same type appear in a certain
way, depending upon which view it's being
displayed in. This appearance is defined in
an instance of the Appearance Definition
class, which describe through the use of
macros how a certain type of object
appears. The Framework supports both an
Implementation-standard, as well as a user-
defined, appearance definition of an object
type." – The set up for a specific
appearance is considered as specific
'configuration' for a view.

It would have been obvious to a person of
ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention was made to supplement
Dardinski disclosure of the free-form grid
editor by utilizing the 'user-specific'
concept taught by Current Applicant for the
purpose of defining the structure and
layout of the application user interface.(see
paragraph 0003 of current application).

2. The method of claim 1 further comprising:

transmitting the user interface display code to a client digital processing system in response to a request to access the application.

For the feature of claim 1 see claim 1 rejection. In Dardinski, column 108, lines 48-49, "The Download Agents rely on Download Servers to **transmit the information to the target systems** (*client digital processing system*)." – the parameters can be transmitted to the client(s), the client/server transmitting needs to via Internet. *The Dardinski's teaching not only teaches transmitting the information about the progress but also transmits user interface display code to a client digital processing* system, see Figure 50, and description in column 55, lines 23-33, "FIG. 50 (which reads chronologically from bottom to top) illustrates an object undergoing various edits, each edit establishing a new version of the original object (*original request*). The object is created (version 1.0), and is then downloaded (**Download** A) to the target, synchronizing the online image with the offline. The user then makes a change to the **object** in an offline edit session, then performs a check-in, which creates version 2.0. At this point, the online and the offline images are out of sync. Another offline edit produces version 3.0, which is then downloaded to the target (**Download B**), and the images fall in sync again." – wherein the 'object' can be 'display code', which is currently being edited; the 'downloading' is 'transmitting' to a client digital processing system.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the configuration for the user interface is determined by selecting one or more objects and positioning each of the one or more objects selected in a desired location

For the feature of claim 1 see claim 1 rejection. In Dardinski, FIG. 38 depicts a **sheet template editor** in a system according to the invention; also in Dardinski, column 100, lines 1-3, "The user

of a free-form grid layout.

interface is provided as an IDA **Grid Editor view** (*free-form grid layout*)."

4. The method of claim 2, wherein the request is communicated through the Internet and the user interface display code is hypertext markup language (HTML) code.

For the feature of claim 2 see claim 2 rejection. Dardinski' teaches all aspects of claim 4, but does not mention the 'HTML' specifically. However, Current Applicant teaches this feature in the BACKGROUND (paragraph 0003) of the current application , "The application is created using an **authoring language (e.g. HTML)** that defines the structure and layout of the application UI. ... Typical web-based applications are presented using a client/server programming model. In such a model, an application provider provides the application on a server digital processing system ('DPS'), and an end-user of the application access the application via a client DPS. For example, for web-based applications, the server DPS houses a program that provides requested HTML to a client DPS when requested." – the using of HTML is not novel and patentable.
It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to supplement Dardinski disclosure of the free-form grid editor by utilizing the 'HTML' concept taught by Current Applicant for the purpose of defining the structure and layout of the application user interface.(see paragraph 0003 of current application).

5. The method of claim 3, wherein the one or more objects are selected using a user input device and each of the one or more objects selected is positioned by dragging the object to a desired location of the free-form grid layout.

For the feature of claim 3 see claim 3 rejection. See Dardinski, column 17, lines 42-45, "each instance of the Object Type hierarchy which serves as a reference for a Typed Object requires a definition reference to the **defining Parameterized Object** (*position* can be included) which

defines that Typed Object. This relationship provides quick **access to the definition object** when a **symbolic representation of that definition** is **dragged and dropped** (*dragging the object to a desired location*) into a view." – in order to do the drag and drop, there must be a *user input device* (possibly a mouse) to do it. -- Dardinski's 'symbolic representation' is a definition of an object; 'dragging and dropping the symbolic representation' has the same function as 'dragging and dropping the object' to a desired location.

6. The method of claim 5, further comprising: indicating a desired size for each of the one or more objects selected.

For the feature of claim 5 see claim 5 rejection. See Dardinski, column 3, lines 25-27, "The placeholder objects identify the **sizes**, locations, colors, etc., of the icons used in the editor to represent the configurable objects."

7. The method of claim 6, wherein indicating a desired size for each of the one or more objects selected includes selecting a perimeter of the object at a first location on the free-form grid layout and dragging the perimeter to a second location on the free-form grid layout.

For the feature of claim 6 see claim 6 rejection. For the rest of the feature of claim 7, see claim 5, and 6 rejections. Also, see Dardinski's column 24, lines 44-51, "The endpoints relate the Connection to the Parameter Override to (or from) which the Connection is attached. Endpoints also relate the Connection to the position (side/direction, or center) where the Connection is attached to the object. Each Connection Endpoint is described by **two coordinates**, the side of the object it is on, and the relative position of the endpoint along the side of the rectangle representing the parameterized object. (*perimeter can be produced from these parameters*) This allows the endpoint to retain its relative position along the side, even if **the object is resized**." – (for drag and drop, you need

to select first location then to a second location) the object can be resized to a desired size.

9. The method of claim 3, wherein the free-form grid layout comprises a plurality of grid cells and the set of configuration parameters includes information indicating a position of each of the one or more objects in reference to one or more of the plurality of grid cells.

For the feature of claim 3 see claim 3 rejection. See FIG. 38, it contains a plurality of grid cells. The parameters are discussed in claim 1 rejection.

11. A system comprising:
   a storage device to store, a set of configuration parameters corresponding to a configuration of a user interface of an application;
   a processor coupled to the storage device to dynamically generate user interface display code at run time for a user in response to a request from a client device to access the application, the user interface display code based upon the set of configuration parameters and the user's role within an organization.

In Dardinski, Figure 40, Dardinski's disclosure has database to store the configuration parameters. Again in Dardinski column 108, lines 48-49, "The Download Agents rely on Download Servers to **transmit the information to the target systems**" – this implies that the server will transmit the requested application to the client systems. Also see claim 1 rejection.

12. The system of claim 11, wherein the client device is coupled to the processor through the Internet and the user interface display code is hypertext markup language (HTML) code.

13. The system of claim 11, wherein the configuration is determined by selecting one or more objects and positioning each of the one or more objects selected in a desired location of a free-form grid layout.

For the feature of claim 11 see claim 11 rejection. For the rest of the feature see claim 2 and 4 rejections.

14. The system of claim 13, wherein positioning each of the one or more an objects selected in the desired location of

For the feature of claim 11 see claim 11 rejection. For the rest of claim 13 feature, see claim 5 rejection.

the free-form grid layout includes
indicating a desired size for each of the one
or more objects selected.

15. The system of claim 14, wherein indicating the desired size for each of the one or more objects selected includes selecting a perimeter of the object at a first location on the free-form grid layout and dragging the perimeter to a second location on the free-form grid layout.	For the feature of claim 13 see claim 13 rejection. For the rest of claim 14 feature, see claim 5 and 6 rejections.
17. The system of claim 13, wherein the free-form grid layout comprises a plurality of grid cells and the set of configuration parameters includes information indicating a position of each of the one or more objects selected_in reference to one or more of the plurality of grid cells.	For the feature of claim 14 see claim 14 rejection. For the rest of claim 15 feature, see claim 5 rejection (for drag and drop, you need to select first location then to a second location).
19. A machine-readable medium that provides instructions, which when executed by a processing system, cause the processing system to perform a method comprising: (a) accessing a generic layout file for a user interface of an application, the generic layout file having a free-form grid layout and a set of objects; (b) creating a configuration for a user interface of an application; (c) determining a set of configuration parameters corresponding to the configuration; and (d) dynamically generating user interface display code at run time for a user, the user interface display code based upon the set of configuration parameters and the user's role within an organization.	For the feature of claim 13 see claim 13 rejection. See Figure 38, in Dardinski's disclosure, it allows user to enter more than on grid cells and the set of selected parameters is recorded. For item (a), see Darkinski, Figure 11, and column 15, lines 62-64, "a generic view pane which the application programmer can use for just about anything--e.g., a graphical "canvas", or a grid control able to display data in a spreadsheet-like format". For item (b)-(d), see claim 1 rejection.
20. The machine-readable medium of claim	For the feature of claim 19 see claim 19

19 further comprising:
  transmitting the user interface display code to a client digital processing system in response to a request to access the application.

rejection. For the rest of claim 20 feature, see claim 2 rejection.

21. The machine-readable medium of claim 19, wherein the configuration for the user interface is determined by selecting one or more objects and positioning each of the one or more objects selected in a desired location of a free-form grid layout.

For the feature of claim 19 see claim 19 rejection. For the rest of claim 21 feature, see claim 3 rejection.

22. The machine-readable medium of claim 20, wherein the request is communicated through the Internet and the user interface display code is hypertext mark up language (HTML) code.

For the feature of claim 20 see claim 20 rejection. For the rest of claim 22 feature, see claim 4 rejection.

23. The machine-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the one or more objects are selected using a user input device and each of the one or more objects selected is positioned by dragging the object to a desired location of the free-form grid layout.

For the feature of claim 21 see claim 21 rejection. For the rest of claim 23 feature, see claim 5 rejection.

24. The machine-readable medium of claim 23, wherein the method further comprises indicating a desired size for each of the one or more objects selected.

For the feature of claim 23 see claim 23 rejection. For the rest of claim 24 feature, see claim 6 rejection.

25. The machine-readable medium of claim 24, wherein indicating a desired size for each of the one or more objects selected includes selecting a perimeter of the object at a first location on the free-form grid layout and dragging the perimeter to a second location on the free-form grid layout.

For the feature of claim 24 see claim 24 rejection. For the rest of claim 25 feature, see claim 7 rejection.

26. The machine-readable medium of claim 22, wherein the HTML code is dynamically generated based upon the set of configuration parameters and based upon an origin of the request.

For the feature of claim 22 see claim 22 rejection. For the rest of claim 26 feature see claim 8 rejection.

27. The machine-readable medium of claim 21, wherein the free-form grid layout comprises a plurality of grid cells and the set of configuration parameters includes information indicating a position of each of the one or more objects in reference to one or more of the plurality of grid cells.

For the feature of claim 21 see claim 21 rejection. For the rest of claim 27 feature, see claim 9 rejection.

10.   Claims 10, 18, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,754,885 by Steven Dardinski (hereinafter "Dardinski"), in view of applicant's admission of prior art (hereinafter "current applicant"), further in view of US2004/0117773 by Pascal Nicolle (hereinafter "Nicolle").

CLAIM	Dardinski / Current Applicant / Nicolle
10. The method of claim 9, wherein the set of configuration parameters includes a grid coordinate specifying one of the plurality of grid cells, a column span specifying a first dimension, and a row span specifying a second dimension for each of the one or more objects.	For the feature of claim 9 see claim 9 rejection. See Dardinski, Abstract, "The invention provides improved apparatus for configuring process, environmental, industrial and other control systems. Such apparatus employs "appearance" objects (or other data and/or programming constructs) **defining the appearance of configurable system components in graphical editors** or other views in which the components may be depicted. "Placeholder" objects (or other constructs) persist the **location**, size, color, or other aspects of appearance defined by an appearance object for a configurable component in views in which it is actually depicted." Also in Dardinski, column 37, lines 60-65, "the Sheet

Template is drawn first, as a type of background, then the **Placeholder objects** associated with the document is superimposed upon the drawing surface. The Sheet Template, which is used during printing and/or print preview, is **user-selectable** from the Page Setup dialog." In Dardinski, column 43, lines 12-17, "Each Sheet Template object contains a reference to **one or more representations (*grid cells, grid coordinate*) of Graphical Objects**, via instances of the Abstract Placeholder class. Placeholders are used to provide the mechanism for persistent storage of the **placement of various objects** in the Sheet Template." Dardinski teaches all aspects of claim 10, but does not mention the 'grid coordinate' specifically. However, Nicolle teaches that feature in an analogous art. In Nicolle, paragraph 042, "Graphic **coordinates** are related to the **position of objects in the grid of rows and columns representing a graphic**." It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to supplement Dardinski disclosure of the free-form grid editor by utilizing the 'coordinates' concept taught by Nicolle, for the purpose of representing a graphic (see Nicolle, end of paragraph 42). – Nicolle teaches the deficiency of Dardinski for claim 10.

| 18. The system of claim 17 wherein the set of configuration parameters includes a grid coordinate specifying one of the plurality of grid cells, a column span specifying a first dimension, and a row span specifying a second dimension for each of the one or more objects. | For the feature of claim 17 see claim 17 rejection. For the reset of the feature see claim 10 rejection. |

28. The machine-readable medium of claim 27, wherein the set of configuration parameters includes a grid coordinate specifying one of the plurality of grid cells, a column span specifying a first dimension, and a row span specifying a second dimension for each of the one or more objects.

For the feature of claim 27 see claim 27 rejection. For the rest of claim 28 feature, see claim 10 rejection.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Underwoode, US Patent No. 6,718,535, discloses a method and system for generating an interface is depicted for allowing receipt of the input and display of the output during execution of the sub-activities associated with the selected activity; it uses SiteServer to handle the user security, role and preferences.

Bready et al., US 2004/0.044,556, discloses a planning system includes at least one business rule remote from at least one client, a meeting editor, The user may set up access at the main screen to allow easy access to frequently visited locations within the planner. Additionally, the user interface may be user specific.

12.   The following summarizes the status of the claims:

35 USC § 103 rejection: Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, 27 and 28

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chih-Ching Chow whose telephone number is 571-272-3693. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chih-Ching Chow
Examiner
Art Unit 2191
May 27, 2006

WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

CC